UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL on MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

IN RE: CELEXA AND LEXAPRO PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 1736

(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

CONDITIONAL TRANSFER ORDER (CTO-34)

On February 16, 2006, the Panel transferred 11 civil action(s) to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1407. See 416 F.Supp.2d 1361 (J.P.M.L. 2006). Since that time, 41 additional action(s) have been transferred to the Eastern District of Missouri. With the consent of that court, all such actions have been assigned to the Honorable Rodney W Sippel.

It appears that the action(s) on this conditional transfer order involve questions of fact that are common to the actions previously transferred to the Eastern District of Missouri and assigned to Judge Sippel.

Pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the <u>Rules of Procedure of the United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation</u>, the action(s) on the attached schedule are transferred under 28 U.S.C. §1407 to the Eastern District of Missouri for the reasons stated in the order of February 16, 2006, and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Rodney W Sippel.

This order does not become effective until it is filed in the Office of the Clerk of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri. The transmittal of this order to said Clerk shall be stayed 7 days from the entry thereof. If any party files a notice of opposition with the Clerk of the Panel within this 7–day period, the stay will be continued until further order of the Panel.

Inasmuch as no objection is pending at this time, the stay is lifted.

Jan 24, 2011

CLERK'S OFFICE
UNITED STATES
JUDICIAL PANEL ON
MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

FOR THE PANEL:

Jeffery N. Lüthi Clerk of the Panel

IN RE: CELEXA AND LEXAPRO PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

MDL No. 1736

SCHEDULE CTO-34 - TAG-ALONG ACTIONS

DIST	<u>DIV.</u>	<u>C.A.NO.</u>	CASE CAPTION
CALIFORNIA CENTRAL			
CAC	2	11-00157	Sabrina Simmons–Brill et al v. Forest Laboratories Inc et al